

As has been pointed out, Maryland now has the highest minimum salary schedule for teachers in the nation, with the exception of Alaska. And in terms of purchasing power, when the inflationary economy of Alaska is considered, our State ranks at the very top in the minimum salaries it has established for its teachers. I am proud of this fact, as I know all of you are, we have truly passed an important milestone in public education.

I should like to refer again to the remarks I made before this body a year ago. I said at the time that in the interest of responsible government and sound fiscal management, any new program involving an outlay of additional funds should be accompanied by a plan to finance it. This is a policy which I have adhered to strictly throughout my term of office. It is the simple, homely proposition that one does not, in the exercise of good judgment, order goods or services unless he knows how he is going to pay for them. The Hughes Committee, acknowledging this responsibility estimated the cost of its proposal at a little more than \$16 million and suggested an upward tax revision to finance it.

When it came time for me, as Chief Executive, to plan a legislative program for the 1964 session of the General Assembly, I accepted the Hughes Committee plan of additional State aid for public education with enthusiasm. Once that decision was made, I sat down with my financial advisers, including experts in the educational field, to study the question of financing the program. As you know, we have established by law in Maryland a Board of Revenue Estimates whose responsibility it is to provide me with a statement of estimated revenues for the preparation of a budget.

As you know also, the Governor is required by the Constitution to submit a balanced budget to the General Assembly. The estimate of revenues submitted to me by the Board of Revenue Estimates indicated that if the proposal for additional State aid to education were adopted new revenue resources would be required. Accordingly, acting under my constitutional obligation to submit a balanced budget, and on the advice of legislative leaders, I proposed a one per cent increase in the income tax.

May I digress here for a moment to express my thanks to the officers and members of this Association for the unwavering support they gave me in this cause. Never, during or after the legislative session, did you hesitate to state plainly and boldly that the program would cost money. On the contrary, by deed and by word you asked the